



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/402,010 09/28/99 COE

J PC10030A

HM12/0725

PAUL H GINSBURG
PFIZER INC
235 EAST 42ND STREET
20TH FLOOR
NEW YORK NY 10017-5755

EXAMINER

COLEMAN, B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED:

07/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/402,010

Applicant(s)
COE et al.

Examiner
Brenda Coleman

Art Unit
1624



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 3, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 8-10, and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 8-10, and 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 2, 8-10 and 14-26 are pending in the application.

This action is in response to applicants' amendment dated January 3, 2001. Claim 17, 76, 78, 91 and 97 were amended and claim 96 was canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 3, 2001 have been fully considered with the following effect:

1. The applicant's amendments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections of the last office action which are hereby **withdrawn**.
2. The applicant's amendments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 102 anticipation rejection of the last office action which is hereby **withdrawn**.

In view of the amendment dated January 3, 2001, the following new grounds of rejection apply:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1624

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendment filed January 3, 2001, included the addition of claim 16 which contains eleven species that are not described in the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15, 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

- a) Claim 15 recites the limitation "7-phenyl" in the seventh and eighth species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- b) Claim 16 recites the limitation "5,7-dioxo" in the first and fourth species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- c) Claim 16 recites the limitation "5-oxo" in the second and fifth species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- d) Claim 16 recites the limitation "6-oxo" in the third, sixth and eleventh species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 1624

- e) Claim 16 recites the limitation "5-dioxo" in the seventh and eighth species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- f) Claim 16 recites the limitation "6,7-dioxo" in the ninth and tenth species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- g) Claim 25 recites the limitation "6-one" in the species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- h) Claim 26 recites the limitation "6-oxo" in the species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- i) Claim 26 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by 2(10),3,6,8-tetraene where the double bond to the 6 position creates a pentavalent carbon atom.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1624


5. Claims 1, 2, 8-10 and 14-26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 7-11, 15, 17, 18, 21-24, 27-29 and 32 of copending Application No. 09/514,002. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds of the instant invention embrace the compounds of 09/514,002.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is (703) 305-1880. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the actual number for **OFFICIAL** business is 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


Brenda Coleman
July 24, 2001